

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Masuyuki KIKUSHIMA et al.

Application No.: 09/120,806

Filed: July 23, 1998



Group Art Unit: 2834

Examiner: M. Budd

Docket No.: 101151

For: PIEZO-ELECTRIC RESONATOR AND MANUFACTURING METHOD THEREOF

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

The following remarks are in response to the Office Action dated September 14, 1999. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-22 and 30-37 are pending.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the October 27 telephone interview. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative set forth that the method steps of claim 30 recite a process of making the claimed structure of the product claim 8, and thus must be considered and the Restriction Requirement is improper. During the telephone interview, Supervisory Patent Examiner Ramirez agreed that upon allowance of the apparatus claim, the method claims 30-37 will be rejoined.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8, 10-13 and 15-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Negita (GB 2002-955) in view of Nagai (U.S. Patent No. 4,405,875). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461

*11th Request for
Reconsideration
12/17/99
D. Brew*

Applicants submit that Negita does not disclose or suggest a housing having an opening, an edge portion of the opening and a periphery of the opening being metalized. In fact, as admitted by the Office Action, Negita does not disclose any opening in the housing 8.

Furthermore, Nagai does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 8 missing from Negita. In fact, as shown in Figs. 13-20 of Nagai, the windows 139, 179, 189, 199 and 209 are glass windows. These windows are in no way equivalent to openings in the housing comprising an edge portion and the periphery being metalized, as recited in claim 8.

Contrary to the windows of Nagai, the opening 58 of the application, for example, are throughholes with a metalized edge and periphery. See Fig. 12 of the application, for example. Because these openings are throughholes, it avoids the high material cost of glass, and the production of fine dust from glass exerted which adversely affects the properties of the quartz resonator. See page 2, lines 1-3 of the application, for example.

Accordingly, even if combined, Negita and Nagai do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 8. Because claims 1-6, 10-13 and 15-22 depend from claim 8, claims 1-6, 10-13 and 15-22 also would not have been obvious over Negita and Nagai.


For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1-6, 8, 10-13 and 15-22 would not have been obvious over Negita and Nagai. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 10-13 and 15-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt consideration and due allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.



Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Thu Anh Dang
Registration No. 41,544

JAO:TAD/slm

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

RECEIVED
DEC 15 1999
TO 2100 MAIL ROOM